

A2 Private CP

Solvency Deficits

Energy Affs

Companies say no-projects are too risky,

(Daniel **Gilbert and Justin Scheck '14**, "Big Oil Companies Struggle to Justify Soaring Project Costs," the Wall Street Journal, 1/28/14, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB1000142405270230327704579348332283819314>)
Chevron Corp. CVX -0.26% , Exxon Mobil Corp. XOM +1.20% and Royal Dutch Shell RDSB.LN -0.73% PLC spent more than \$120 billion in 2013 to boost their oil and gas output—about the same cost in today's dollars as putting a man on the moon. But the three oil giants have little to show for all their big spending. Oil and gas production are down despite combined capital expenses of a half-trillion dollars in the past five years. Each company is expected to report later this week a profit decline for 2013 compared with 2012, even though oil prices are high. One of the biggest problems: Costs are soaring for many of the new "megaprojects" to tap petroleum deposits needed to replenish depleting fields. Plans under way to pump oil using man-made islands in the Caspian Sea could cost a consortium that includes Exxon and Shell \$40 billion, up from the original budget of \$10 billion. The price tag for a natural-gas project in Australia, called Gorgon and jointly owned by the three companies, has ballooned 45% to \$54 billion. Shell is spending at least \$10 billion on untested technology to build a natural-gas plant on a large boat so the company can tap a remote field, according to people who have worked on the project. Finding the next gusher has always been a risky business, sending oil companies beneath the ocean floor and into unstable parts of Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Now the pursuit is trickier and more expensive than ever. The easiest-to-reach oil ran dry long ago, and the most prolific fields often are controlled by state-owned companies in places like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. As a result, Chevron, Exxon and Shell are digging even deeper into their pockets, putting their usually reliable profit margins in jeopardy. Exxon is borrowing more, dipping into its cash pile and buying back fewer shares to help the Irving, Texas, company cover capital costs. Exxon has said such costs would hit about \$41 billion last year, up 51% from \$27.1 billion in 2009. As they pursued the big-bet strategy, the three oil giants arrived late to the shale boom in North America, where they missed out on profits raked in by smaller, nimbler companies that pioneered how to extract oil and gas from the dense rock.

Perm/Fed Key

Federal involvement creates a national strategy, that's key to solve scientific advances,

(Commission on Ocean Policy '4, preliminary report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, Chapter 25: "Creating a National Strategy for Increasing Scientific Knowledge," 4/20/04, <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/oceancommission/documents/prelimreport/chapter25.pdf>)

The United States does not have a national strategy for ocean and coastal research, **exploration**, and marine operations **that can integrate ongoing efforts, promote synergies among federal**, state, and local governments, academia, **and the private sector, translate** scientific and technological **advances into operational applications, and establish national goals and objectives** for addressing high-priority issues. Instead, for the most part, **each** federal ocean **agency independently addresses its** own specific information **needs. A national strategy can** help **meet** the ocean **resource management challenges** of the 21st century **and ensure** that **useful products** result **from federal investments** in ocean research. Moving toward **ecosystem-based management approaches will require a new** generation of **scientific understanding**. Specifically, **more needs to be known about how marine ecosystems function** on varying spatial scales, **how human activities affect marine ecosystems** and how, in turn, these changes affect human health. Ecosystem-based management will also require a deeper understanding of biological, physical, chemical, and socioeconomic processes and interactions. For example, as coastal population growth feeds a demand for new construction, managers will need to know which activities may cause rapid erosion of the beach, increased turbidity that harms a coral reef, or economic disruption. In another example, fishery conservation can be promoted by protecting spawning grounds and other essential habitat; to make this possible, scientists and managers must understand the fundamental biology of the fish species. **Maintaining overall ecosystem health** also **requires** an **improved understanding of biological diversity** on different levels, including genetic diversity (the variety of genetic traits within a single species), species diversity (the number of species within an ecosystem), and ecosystem diversity (the number of different ecosystems on Earth). **The largest threats** to maintaining diversity on all three scales **are human activities**, such as overfishing, pollution, habitat alteration, and introductions of non-native species. The extent of marine biological diversity, like so much about the ocean, remains unknown. But based on the rate at which new species are currently being discovered, continued exploration of the ocean is almost certain to result in the documentation of many additional species that can provide fresh insights into the origin of life and human biology. **A national strategy should promote the** scientific and technological **advances required to** observe, **monitor**, assess, and predict **environmental** events and long-term **trends**. Foremost in this category is climate change. **The role of the ocean in climate**, although critical, **remains poorly understood**. The ocean has 1000 times the heat capacity of the freshwater lakes and rivers, ocean circulation drives the global heat balance, and ocean biochemistry plays a primary role in controlling the global carbon cycle. The process of climate change should be examined both on geologic time scales, such as the transitions between ice ages, and over shorter periods of time. The buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere will increase the melting of polar ice, introducing large quantities of fresh water into the North Atlantic. Many researchers now believe that could drastically change ocean circulation and weather patterns in the span of a couple of years.¹ In particular, the Gulf Stream could slow or stop, causing colder temperatures along the eastern seaboard of the United States and ramifications around the globe. It is in man's interests to learn more about the processes that lead to abrupt climate changes, as well as their potential ecological, economic, and social impacts. Even as we try to comprehend the role of the ocean in climate change, we need also to understand the effects of climate change on ocean ecosystems. If temperatures around the globe continue to warm, sea level will continue to rise, putting many coastal residents at greater risk from storm surges and erosion. For individual ecosystems, even small changes in ocean temperature can put the health and lives of sea creatures and humans at risk. **Ocean monitoring, through** programs like the **IOOS, will be essential** for detecting and predicting changes more accurately, thereby improving prospects for minimizing harmful effects. Some large initiatives, such as the U.S. Climate Change Science Program and the Census of Marine Life, have been launched in the last couple of years to study large-scale research topics. However, many of the issues most relevant to the needs of coastal managers do not occur on such global scales. Due to the regional nature of many ocean and coastal ecosystem processes, regional-scale research programs are also needed. Currently, **insufficient emphasis is placed on this kind of research**. The regional ocean information programs discussed in Chapter 5 are designed to close this gap and increase our understanding of ocean and coastal ecosystems by prioritizing, coordinating, and funding research that meets regional and local management needs. At the state level, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) National Sea Grant College Program can make essential contributions to achieving research goals. The state Sea Grant programs have the organization and infrastructure necessary to fund research and conduct educational activities that will expand understanding of ocean ecosystems up and down our coasts. Sea Grant's current strategic plan focuses on promoting ecosystem-based management and on involving constituencies from **government**, universities, the public **and the private sector**, all of whom **are needed to strengthen the U.S. research enterprise**.² **It is time for** the United States to establish **a national strategy for ocean research investments, and** oversee **implementation and funding** of programs **throughout the** ocean science **community**. This plan

should address issues at the global, regional, state, and local levels. It should emphasize ecosystem-based science **to help resolve the** current mismatch between the size and complexity of marine ecosystems and the **fragmented nature of** science and **the federal structure**. Better **coordination and integration will** help **provide the information needed to sustain resources**, protect human lives and property, identify and nurture new beneficial uses, **and resolve issues** that result **from competing activities**. **A unified national approach** to ocean research, exploration, and marine operations, **structured around national investment priorities, will** also **result in wiser** and more efficient **use of resources**.

Federal action is necessary-coordination of resources,

(Commission on Ocean Policy '4, preliminary report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, Chapter 25: "Creating a National Strategy for Increasing Scientific Knowledge," 4/20/04, <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/oceancommission/documents/prelimreport/chapter25.pdf>)

Better coordination of ocean and coastal research **is needed at all levels and** across all **sectors**. **Increases in funding**, changes in grant practices, **and the establishment of new partnerships are all essential to maximize the national research enterprise**. Advances in social science and economic research are particularly important to **generate information needed for** the wise **management of ocean resources**. Reviving the Federal Investment **The United States has** a wealth of **ocean research expertise spread across a network of government and industry laboratories** and world-class universities, colleges, and marine centers. **With strong federal support, these institutions made the United States the world leader** in oceanography during the 20th century. However, a leader cannot stand still. Ocean and coastal **management issues continue to grow** in number and complexity, new fields of study have emerged, new interdisciplinary approaches are being tried, and **there is a growing need to understand the ocean** on a global and regional scale. All **this has created** a corresponding **demand for high-quality scientific information**. **Federal investments** during the cold war years of the 1960s and 1970s **enabled scientists** to help promote our national economy and security through research into the fundamental physical, chemical, biological, and geological properties of the oceans. During that period, ocean research funding constituted 7 percent of the federal research budget. However, the **federal investment** in ocean research **began to stagnate** in the early 1980s, while investments in other fields of science continued to grow (Figure 25.2).³ As a result, ocean research investments comprise a meager 3.5 percent of today's federal portfolio. **The current annual federal investment** of approximately \$650 million in marine science **is well below the level necessary to address adequately the nation's needs** for coastal and ocean information. **Unless funding increases** sharply, **the gap** between requirements and resources **will continue to grow** and the United States will lose its position as the world's leader in ocean research.

Federal authority is key to make the cp work,

(Commission on Ocean Policy '4, preliminary report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, Chapter 25: "Creating a National Strategy for Increasing Scientific Knowledge," 4/20/04, <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/oceancommission/documents/prelimreport/chapter25.pdf>)

To ensure that increased investments are used wisely and that **important research activities continue**, federal **agencies** will **need to create long-term strategic plans and remedy structural problems in their grant mechanisms**. In creating long-term plans, **a balance must be reached between** funding basic, **curiosity-driven research conducted** mostly **at** universities and **marine research centers and** more **applied research conducted** largely **at government laboratories** to support operations, management, and monitoring activities. Over time, changes in national priorities may shift the balance slightly between basic and applied research but the enduring value, and often unexpected outcomes, of basic research should never be underestimated. Basic oceanographic research in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s increased our understanding of ocean currents, marine acoustics, seafloor geology, and robotics, and basic research supported by the U.S. Navy has led to many widely-used and versatile new technologies, such as the Global Positioning System. **Improved cooperation between federal labs and academic institutions can combine the strengths of both, ensure** that **quality research** is conducted, **and achieve a balance** between basic and applied science. **Problems in the current system** for awarding federal research grants **make it difficult to conduct** the kind of interdisciplinary, ecosystem-based **research required to understand the ocean environment**. **Short-term research grants** of two- to five-years duration **are** now **typical**. This type of funding is useful for research on discrete topics of limited scope, and has the advantage of giving agencies the flexibility to adjust quickly to changing priorities. However, **it is not adequate to acquire** the **continuous data sets** that will be **essential for examining environmental changes** over time. In addition, a variety of mechanisms are used by federal agencies to review proposed ocean

research grants. Some of these mechanisms work better than others. Grant review systems that are not open to all applicants or that do not use an objective review process for ranking proposals are unlikely to produce the highest quality research. Systems that favor established researchers to the detriment of young scientists, whether intentionally or not, are also flawed, stifling diversity and limiting the infusion of new ideas. When all research proposals, including those from scientists working at federal labs, are subject to the same rigorous review process, tax dollars are more likely to support the best science. Streamlined grant application and review processes will also help get more good science done in a timely way. The ocean science community includes many scientists outside academic and federal labs. Although coordination among sectors has steadily improved, the process remains mainly ad hoc, without the backing of a national strategy and leadership. A clearer understanding of the respective strengths and roles of the different sectors could lead to productive new research partnerships, foster intellectual risk-taking, leverage funding, and encourage participation in large multi-sector research efforts valuable to the nation. There is also a need to gain feedback from managers at state and federal levels and from the private sector that can guide new research directions and technology development. The regional ocean information programs recommended in Chapter 5 will provide an excellent mechanism for gaining input on user needs and regional research priorities. A mechanism is required to coordinate federally funded ocean research (both basic and applied), support long-term projects, and create partnerships throughout all agencies and sectors. Transparent and comprehensive research plans would achieve these goals and ensure that research results can be translated into operational products in a timely manner.

Bioprospecting DA

CP leads to bioprospecting-profit motive,

(Salvatore **Arico** and Charlotte **Salpin** '5, Arico is the Programme Specialist for Biodiversity at UNESCO's Division of Ecological and Earth Sciences with a PhD in Marine Environment and Resources, Salpin is a legal officer at the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea for the UN Office of Legal Affairs, United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies report, "Bioprospecting of Genetic Resources in the Deep Seabed: Scientific, Legal and Policy Aspects," 2005, <http://i.unu.edu/media/unu.edu/publication/28370/DeepSeabed1.pdf>)

Over the last twenty to twenty-five years, **new uses of the oceans** and their **resources have emerged**. Most of these changes have been **driven by technological developments** and knowledge acquired **as a result of scientific explorations** of previously unknown oceanic areas. **An example** of new use of the oceans **is bioprospecting**, i.e. the search for, and commercial development of, valuable natural compounds. More particularly, marine scientists and **bioprospectors have paid** increasing **attention to species which have developed unique** biological and physiological **properties** to survive in extreme environmental conditions. These species, called extremophiles, are **found in areas such as** Antarctica and **the deep seabed**. In the absence of an internationally-agreed definition of the term "deep seabed," this report uses the term to designate the seabed and ocean floor and its subsoil beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, this is also called the "Area." **As technology develops** and becomes more widely available, scientific **research in these** extreme **environments is likely to increase**. Not only will this allow expanding our knowledge of extreme ocean ecosystems in order to improve their conservation and sustainable use, but this will also provide opportunities to discover valuable resources and compounds of potential application to the food, industrial and pharmaceutical sectors, among others. **There is currently no specific** international **regime addressing bioprospecting** in the deep seabed, and in recent years, **concerns have been raised regarding uncontrolled collection and exploitation of genetic resources** from the deep seabed. **The issues that governments**, scientists and representatives of the civil society **have highlighted as requiring** particular **attention include**: the **lack of knowledge** about deep sea **ecosystems, which are** still **largely unexplored; the need to identify** the **impacts that** marine scientific **research** and other activities, including fishing practices, **have** on these ecosystems; the need to ensure the sharing of benefits arising from utilizing deep seabed genetic resources; and whether the recovery of deep seabed genetic resources and subsequent development of commercial products is, or should be, subject to an international legal regime, and if so, to which regime and how. The international community has taken steps towards addressing these issues, some of which were brought to the attention of States by the UN Secretary-General as early as 1995. Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity have agreed, at their seventh meeting in 2004, to carry out information-gathering activities regarding the status and trends of, and threats to, genetic resources beyond national jurisdiction, as well as activities and processes under Parties' jurisdiction or control, which may have significant adverse impact on deep seabed ecosystems. At its 59th session in 2004, the United Nations General Assembly established an Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction. This Working Group is likely to have to consider such activities as the search for, and commercial development of, deep seabed genetic resources, including whether there is a need for a unified regime to address them. **Regulating activities relating to deep seabed genetic resources requires** taking into account **a broad range of considerations, including environmental, scientific, economic, ethical, legal and political aspects**. On the environmental front, there is a need to balance the sustainable use of these resources with conservation needs. On the scientific side, **questions include the role of scientists**, either publicly or **privately funded, since they** often **represent the first point of access to deep seabed resources, identify the potential of these resources for biotechnology**, and contribute to, **and** benefit from, the **development of commercial products** derived from them. **From an economic point of view**, which is linked to the ethical aspect, **deep seabed genetic resources are a potential source of significant profit for the private companies** and scientific institutions **involved in their development and application. This raises questions about** whether and how exclusive **private rights** can be obtained **over genetic resources recovered from the seabed** beyond national jurisdiction, whether sharing the benefits derived from their utilization is required, and if so, how. Legal and political issues include: the status of deep seabed genetic resources as open-access or as common heritage of humankind; the development of a sui generis system of intellectual property rights; and States' obligations with regard to activities carried out under their jurisdiction or control in international areas.

Bioweapon terror in the future because of bio-break throughs

The Hindu October 23, **2001** <http://www.hindu.com/2001/10/23/stories/13230291.htm>

The biotechnology holds the promise of a great future but like any other technological breakthrough, it is a double-edged sword. Biotechnology could be panacea for eliminating hunger and disease from the globe but the same biotechnology tools can be used in a deadly manner against the [hu]mankind. Modern technologies that add efficiency, power and wonder to our lives inevitably deliver the same benefits to evildoers. According to Bill Joy, the chief scientist of Sun Microsystems, "the tragedy of September 11 was nothing like what might be possible with biological weaponry." In his forthcoming book titled Why the Future Doesn't Need Us, Joy has predicted that the coming age of biotech will undoubtedly make programmable bacteria and viruses more accessible — to doctors, business and bio-terrorists. "The things which we are worrisome about haven't happened yet." And having in mind all these, Harvard biologists, Matthew Meselson and Leading, have suggested a convention making any individual involved in the production of biological weapons liable as an international criminal, prosecutable anywhere, as is already the case for pirates and airplane hijackers. This proposal would permit countries to research and plan defensive work against biological warfare agents.

Extinction

John **Steinbrunner**, Senior Fellow at Brookings, **1998**, Foreign Policy Winter 1998, Pg. 85

That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon But for a few pathogens--ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use--the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.

Link

Incentives to develop for-profit medical technology-CP fails,

(Claire **Andre and Manuel Velasquez '88**, Andre was Associate Director at the Markkula Center for applied Ethics at Santa Clara University, Velasquez is a professor of management and business ethics at Santa Clara University, "A Healthy Bottom Line: Profits or People?" Issues in Ethics Volume 1 Number 4, Summer 1988, <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v1n4/healthy.html>)

With little public warning, **a concern for "good business" has moved to the heart of health care**, a sector **once** relatively **insulated from** the pursuit of **profit** that drives the rest of the U.S. economy. Throughout our history, medical institutions have largely been "charitable," nonprofit establishments existing primarily to serve the community. But during the past 20 years, the number of **for-profit health care** facilities, ranging from national hospital chains affiliated with major academic institutions to local dialysis centers, **has grown** at a rate exceeding even that of the computer industry. The ethical implications of the growing commercialization of health care have become a matter of heated controversy. Those favoring the trend toward health care for profit claim that an increased role for entrepreneurs and competition in the delivery of health care will result in a more efficient and effective health care system. For others, **the pursuit of profit is antithetical to** the values central to **medicine**. Opposing the commercialization of health care are those who base their arguments on considerations of justice. They argue that **a society** as wealthy as ours **has a moral obligation to meet the basic needs** of all **of its members**. Every American, rich or poor, should have access to the health care he or she needs. The **escalating costs** of care **and** a growing **unwillingness** of insurance companies **to cover** these **costs**, along with government budget cutbacks, **have** severely **restricted access to health care** for the poor, the aged, and those with catastrophic health problems. **The rise of for-profit health care only exacerbates the** growing **problem of access** to care. **Studies show** that the **growth of for-profits decreases the availability of health care for "unprofitable" patients**. Traditionally, non-profits have financed care for the poor by overcharging paying patients to subsidize services for the poor. For-profits, by refusing to serve nonpaying patients while at the same time taking a great share of paying patients, leave non profits with more of the poor to serve but with fewer paying patients to subsidize their care. Furthermore, **by serving only profitable patients and offering only profitable services, for profits** are able to **generate high revenues, which enables them to charge lower prices** for their services and to invest in attractive facilities located in areas convenient to paying patients, both of **which create substantial competition** for non-profits. As a result, it has become increasingly difficult for non-profits to continue to serve those who can't pay. **Opponents** of commercialized health care also **argue** that **for-profit health care institutions do not contribute their "fair share" to society**. In view of the benefits health care institutions derive from society, **it is unfair** for them **to refuse to help society serve those who** can't afford care or **are too costly** to treat. All hospitals benefit from government subsidized programs like Medicare and Medicaid. **They** also **profit from medical research** and medical education paid for by taxpayers' money. In fairness, hospitals have an obligation to serve society's needy. **Investor-owned corporations** that turn away patients who can't afford to pay **fail to discharge this obligation**. Moreover, by not taking their fair share of unprofitable patients, **for-profits place an undue burden** on nonprofit and public hospitals. It's unjust that the costs of serving these patients should fall more heavily on nonprofit institutions.

Impacts

Bioprospecting causes spread of infectious diseases

BBC News February **2002** "The Dangers of Bio-prospecting"

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in_depth/sci_tech/2002/boston_2002/1823770.stm

As scientists scour our planet for previously undescribed and **exotic lifeforms**, they are acutely aware of the health dangers they could also be digging up. **Probably less than one percent of all the microbes on Earth have been categorised by science,** and some of the as yet unidentified species could show us how to tap new energy sources and make novel drugs. But **it is** also **likely that many of these** simple **organisms** - were they ever to come into contact with large numbers of people - **could trigger the emergence of new infectious diseases.** "It's not so much that we are worried that a devil is going to emerge from the bowels of the Earth, but **there is no need to take the chance,**" said Professor Abigail Salyers, the current president of the American Society of Microbiology. She was making her comments at a symposium sponsored by the society at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Boston. Out of this world **"We must accept the fact that we don't know how many microbes in nature really are capable of causing disease in humans. We thought we knew - but we don't. We don't even know what 99.8% of the organisms are."** The issue is a pertinent one because of the growing interest in extremophiles, the microbes that can live in extraordinary environments that many thought, just a few years ago, would be utterly lifeless. **Scientists are now finding bugs in hydrothermal vents on the deep-ocean floor, in the dry deserts of Antarctica and in rocks and springs hundreds of metres below the surface of the Earth. These amazing organisms have fundamentally different metabolisms,** "breathing" not oxygen but hydrogen, methane, and compounds of sulphur. They can withstand extremes of temperature, radiation, salinity, and metal toxicity. Scientists think the microbes will tell us about how life first formed on the Earth and how it might now thrive on other planets, perhaps even in our own Solar System. They could also yield novel technologies and drugs. Martian bugs "There are all sorts of chemical processes that we're discovering, things that the chemists told us were impossible but that we now know micro-organisms are doing," Professor Salyers said. But **the question arises and needs seriously to be addressed about what impact these new organisms could have on our health.** "We are still not sure when and under what conditions micro-organisms evolve the capacity to cause disease," said Professor Salyers.

Extinction

John **Steinbruner** (Senior Fellow at Brookings Institution) **1998** "Biological weapons: A plague upon all houses," Foreign Policy, Dec 22, LN

It is a considerable comfort and undoubtedly **a key to our survival** that, so far, the main lines of defense against this threat have not depended on explicit policies or organized efforts. In the long course of evolution, the human body has developed physical barriers and a biochemical immune system whose sophistication and effectiveness exceed anything we could design or as yet even fully understand. But evolution is a sword that cuts both ways: **New diseases emerge, while old diseases mutate and adapt.** Throughout history, **there have been epidemics during which human immunity has broken down on an epic scale. An infectious agent believed to have been the plague bacterium killed an estimated 20 million people over a four-year period** in the fourteenth century, including nearly one-quarter of Western Europe's population at the time. Since its recognized appearance in 1981, some 20 variations of the HIVvirus have infected an estimated 29.4 million worldwide, with 1.5 million people currently dying of aids each year. Malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera-once thought to be under control-are now making a

comeback. As we enter the twenty-first century, changing conditions have enhanced the potential for widespread contagion. The rapid growth rate of the total world population, the unprecedented freedom of movement across international borders, and scientific advances that expand the capability for the deliberate manipulation of pathogens are all cause for worry that the problem might be greater in the future than it has ever been in the past. The threat of infectious pathogens is not just an issue of public health, but a fundamental security problem for the species as a whole.

Infrastructure Tradeoff DA

Private infrastructure coming now and it's key to the economy,

(White House '14, "Fact Sheet: Building a 21st Century Infrastructure: Increasing Public and Private Collaboration with the Build America Investment Initiative," Office of the White House Press Secretary, 7/17/14, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/07/17/fact-sheet-building-21st-century-infrastructure-increasing-public-and-pr>)

Investing in a 21st century American **infrastructure is an important part of the President's plan to build on the** progress our **economy** is making **by creating jobs and expanding opportunity** for all hardworking Americans. **Modern and efficient infrastructure** – whether **moving goods** to our harbors **and** ports or **connecting people to services** or gigabits to our offices and homes – **helps** small **businesses to expand, manufacturers to export, investors to bring jobs** to our shores, **and lowers prices** for goods and services for American families. The President has been very clear that **we need to do more to improve our infrastructure** in order **to create jobs, provide certainty** to states and communities, **help** American **businesses, and grow our economy**. He has put forth a long-term proposal that would do just that and pay for it by closing unfair tax loopholes and making commonsense reforms to our business tax system, while providing the certainty of reliable federal funding to states and communities. And while the President is encouraged that Congress is heeding these calls by taking action in the short-term to prevent transportation projects across the country from grinding to a halt, the President will continue to act on his own to promote American economic growth where there is need or opportunity. And right now, **there is a real opportunity to put private capital to work in revitalizing U.S. infrastructure**. That is why **today, the President will** sign a Presidential Memorandum to **launch the Build America Investment Initiative**, a government-wide initiative **to increase infrastructure investment and economic growth by engaging with** state and local governments and **private sector investors to encourage collaboration, expand the market for** public-private partnerships (PPPs) and **put federal credit programs to greater use. Starting with** the **transportation** sector, **this** initiative **will harness the potential of private capital** to complement government funding.

Economic decline causes war

Royal 10 (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal, and Political Perspectives, pg 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of **economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations** either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.⁴ Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the

capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government.

“Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that **periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.** In summary, recent economic scholarship **positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.**⁵ This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

Uniqueness

Private funding for infrastructure coming-Obama initiative,

(David **Ludwig '14**, "Obama Unveils New initiative to Encourage Private Funding of Public Infrastructure," Government Executive, 7/17/14, <http://www.govexec.com/management/2014/07/obama-unveils-new-initiative-encourage-private-funding-public-infrastructure/89023/>)

President **Obama announced plans for a new infrastructure initiative** Thursday to bypass congressional gridlock by **promoting private investment in public projects**. Obama arrived in Wilmington, Delaware, where he held a press conference near a portion of highway I-495, which has been closed since last month. The bridge, which runs through the city and carries an estimated 90,000 vehicles per day, was closed after engineers discovered four support columns were tilting to the side. **The Build America Investment Initiative will** establish a committee to **look for ways private businesses can more easily invest in American infrastructure projects**. A new center at the Transportation Department will be tasked with the initiative. Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx and Secretary of the Treasury Jack Lew will oversee **a committee** within the center **to help find ways to eliminate** the **barriers** that **private companies face when investing in public works projects**. "**The president's** visit and **announcement** today **are** a **part of the administration's** continued **push to highlight the importance of investing in** our nation's **infrastructure so that we can build on the progress our economy is making by creating jobs and expanding opportunity** for all hard-working Americans," a White House official said in a statement. The trip comes two days after the House of Representatives passed a temporary measure that will continue to fund the Highway Trust Fund through next May, keeping nearly 200,000 people from being laid off, The Washington Post reported. **The Highway Trust Fund**, which was established in 1956 to repair American roads and bridges through money raised by the federal gas tax, **has continued to face financial hardships** as vehicles increase their fuel efficiency standards. The temporary House measure raises money through an accounting loophole, raising corporate tax bills by allowing corporations to delay pension payments. **Congress doesn't appear close to agreeing on a permanent solution to the problem.**

Links

Domestic investment crowds out foreign investment

Bayraktar and Yasemin, Professors Econ Hacettepe University, '11 (Saglam and Yalta, "Dynamic Linkages Among Foreign Direct Investment, Public Investment And Private Investment: Evidence From Turkey" Applied Econometrics and International Development, Vol 11-2, <http://www.usc.es/~economet/saglam-yalta.pdf>)

In the last twenty years, many developing countries have undertaken fiscal and financial reforms to encourage the inflow of foreign direct investment (FDI), expecting FDI flows to bring new technology, know-how and managerial skills. The amount of FDI flows to developing countries grew steadily in the 1990s and reached \$583 billion in 2009 in current US dollars (World Bank, 2009). The increasing importance of FDI flows as a source of external funding for recipient countries has encouraged research into the channels through which FDI might be expected to

promote economic growth. **Because the link between foreign and domestic investment constitutes the key point in evaluating the FDI-growth nexus**, a number of **studies have emerged to investigate whether FDI and domestic investment are complements or substitutes** in the recipient countries. The findings point out that **the effects of FDI on domestic capital accumulation may vary from country to country depending on the domestic policies**, degree of financial development (Alfaro et al., 2004), educational level (Borenstein et al., 1998), the size of the technological gap between multinational and domestic firms (De Mello, 1999), the types of FDI that a country receives and the sectoral distribution of FDI. The positive impact of FDI on domestic investment is realized when FDI introduces new industries to the host country (Lipsey, 2002), provides new investment opportunities for local firms through the provision of machinery and technology (Sun, 1998), and creates new demand for local inputs (Cardoso and Dornbusch, 1989) 1. On the other hand, **foreign and domestic investments are likely to be substitutes if foreign firms compete with domestic firms for the use of domestic resources and eliminate investment opportunities for the domestic investors** (Fry, 1992; Jansen, 1995; Agosin and Mayer, 2000) 2. In this case, **the effect of FDI on economic growth can be dampened** and the role of FDI on the economies of recipient countries can be questionable.

CP Trades off-realigns private capital,

(UNTT '13, UNTT Working Group on Sustainable Development Financing, Chapter 3: "Challenges in Raising Private Sector Resources for Financing Sustainable Development," United Nations Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, 2013, <http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2106Chapter%203-challenges%20in%20raising%20private%20sector%20resources.pdf>)

The challenge lies in promoting a financial **system that incentivizes** such a **reallocation**. Both **private sources** (including banks, institutional investors, and direct investors) and public resources, domestically and internationally, **will be necessary**. **Public and private resources should**, however, **not be** necessarily **seen as substitutes**, as **they have different investment objectives**. Despite small (but growing) pockets of socially conscious investors, **most private capital remains driven by the profit motive**. As a result, **the private sector will under-invest in public goals when the expected return underperforms other investment opportunities** on a risk adjusted basis. Hence it is important to recognize upfront that public financing and public sector policies are the lynchpin of a development financing strategy. **This paper lays out** some of the **challenges** associated **with raising private sector financing for sustainable development**, with the aim of better **identifying the role for public sector policies to leverage private resources** for investment in sustainable development. This paper argues that **there are many reasons** that **the private sector does not invest sufficiently** in sustainable development in both developed and developing countries, **including high risks**, such as **regulatory uncertainty** and weak governance on a country level, and **structural impediments, such as imperfect information and other market failures**. At the same time, the paper finds that there are impediments on the investor side, including institutional factors and **short-term oriented investor incentives**, which **make it** is **unlikely** that **the private sector will invest sufficiently** in sustainable development on its own. The paper concludes that **the public sector will need to** make a fourfold contribution to **incentivize greater private sector investment** in sustainable development **by**: i) **reducing risks and impediments to investment** by creating a stronger enabling environment, including through an effective legal, policy and regulatory framework, as well as responding to other market failures; ii) **sharing risks** between the public and private sector **by catalyzing and leveraging private investment** through new financing models; iii) **aligning private sector incentives with public goals**; and (v) **balancing** regulations and **policies to ensure financial system stability, with access to credit** and financial services. For more elaborate discussion on some of these topics, this paper should be read in conjunction with the three companion papers in this series.

Neg

Infrastructure not key—multiplier effect doesn't solve econ

Kurtzleben 11-Data Reporter @ US News and World Report, Former Research Assistant @ George Washington University, MA in International Relations, Media, and Public Affairs @ George Washington University [Danielle, US News, "Are Infrastructure Projects the Answer to America's Jobs Problem?" 8/22/2011, <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2011/08/22/are-infrastructure-projects-the-answer-to-americas-jobs-problem>, DKP]

The theory behind infrastructure spending is the multiplier effect: the idea that every dollar in government expenditures can increase GDP by more than one dollar by starting economic chain reactions: the government pays firms for goods and services and those firms then pay employees who then spend their paychecks. Moody's Analytics estimates that the multiplier effect for increases in government spending is generally larger than the multiplier for tax cuts. Any additional dollar spent on permanent tax cuts adds to GDP by significantly less than a dollar. Making the Bush tax cuts permanent, for example, would add to GDP by \$0.29 for every dollar of revenue reduction, according to calculations from Moody's. Infrastructure spending would add by \$1.59 for every dollar spent, while extending unemployment insurance and temporarily increasing food stamps would add even more. The mitigating factor, then, is the speed (or lack thereof) with which infrastructure spending works. In past recessions, infrastructure projects have taken so long to get off the ground that their effects were only felt after recovery had begun, says Alan Viard, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank. "Dollar for dollar, [tax cuts and direct government payments] may not stimulate the economy as much as infrastructure spending, but they can be timed effectively. ... If we expect [economic weakness] to last long enough for new infrastructure spending to come online, we've really got pretty serious problems."

Infrastructure investment has no effect on jobs and generates a net negative effect – tradeoffs between regions,

Wachs 11

(Martin, Professor Emeritus of Civil and Environmental Engineering and City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley, and former Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies and of the University of California Transportation Center. He is also former Chair of the Department of Urban Planning at UCLA. He is currently a Senior Research Associate at the RAND Corporation., "Transportation, Jobs, and Economic Growth", http://www.uctc.net/access/38/access38_transportation_growth.shtml)

By building an effective transportation network, government transportation spending draws jobs to those industries that benefit from the investment. At the same time, this shift of resources moves jobs away from activities that would have been financed in the absence of the transportation investment. So while transportation investment can "create jobs," it can also destroy them. The overall effect is positive only when it creates more and better jobs, or more and better economic activity, than it eliminates. Determining whether a project's effects are going to be positive or negative can be difficult. **A transportation investment might shift jobs, not just across industries and sectors, but also across counties and states. Even a transportation investment that destroys more jobs than it creates can look good, especially in the short term, from the perspective of the winning state or city. Gains and losses might be unevenly distributed, temporally as well as spatially.** For example, building an ill-advised rail line might give a local economy a short-term boost in employment, only to saddle taxpayers with large operating deficits in the future. **From a national perspective, and over time, gains that are immediate and obvious can be—and often are—outweighed by diffuse losses elsewhere. Suppose federal money was used to build a new highway link between a port and freight rail hub. The new link might cut delivery time within the region. The prospect of improved inventory management, increased sales, and other sources of profit would draw cargo to that port, increase port jobs, expand employment related to regional highway goods movement, and increase business at the rail hub. At the same time, it would likely reduce traffic to competing ports in other regions and create exactly the**

same chain reaction—in reverse—in those other areas. Employment would be lost as business is attracted to the competing port. The economy as a whole would be better off only if the increased productivity in the target area exceeded the cost of the highway investment and the loss of business in competing regions. Not all transportation investments meet these criteria. In the example above, suppose the highway link was built not at the high-productivity port, but instead, because of political considerations, in a region that has a less-busy port with little congestion. **While more people in the less-productive region are employed in the construction of the facility, people in the more-productive region are likely to lose jobs, and the overall effect is likely to be negative.** That is precisely why a "bridge to nowhere" in one particular state is a poor national investment even though it may benefit construction workers and others where it is built. In Los Angeles, the Alameda Corridor freight rail project greatly improved connectivity between the ports and the ground freight shipment system, but **some of its benefits must be offset by calculating the growth that it redirected away from other ports such as Seattle or Oakland, given that shipping is a highly competitive economic sector.**

US not key

The Economist 7 (November 23, "America's Vulnerable Economy", pg. 13)

The best hope that global growth can stay strong lies instead with emerging economies. A decade ago, the thought that so much depended on these crisis-prone places would have been terrifying. Yet thanks largely to economic reforms, their annual growth rate has surged to around 7%. **This year they will contribute half of the globe's GDP growth, measured at market exchange rates, over three times as much as America.** In the past, **emerging economies** have often needed bailing out by the rich world. This time they **could be the rescuers.** Of course, a recession in America would reduce emerging economies' exports, but they are less vulnerable than they used to be. **America's importance as an engine of global growth has been exaggerated. Since 2000 its share of world imports has dropped from 19% to 14%. Its vast current-account deficit has started to shrink, meaning that America is no longer pulling along the rest of the world.** Yet growth in emerging economies has quickened, partly thanks to demand at home. In the first half of this year the increase in consumer spending (in actual dollar terms) in China and India added more to global GDP growth than that in America. Most emerging economies are in healthier shape than ever (see article). They are no longer financially dependent on the rest of the world, but have large foreign-exchange reserves—no less than three-quarters of the global total. Though there are some notable exceptions, most of them have small budget deficits (another change from the past), so they can boost spending to offset weaker exports if need be.